India

FOR THE

No. 65. New Series. No. 159. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1899.

Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 157
India at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century 160
The Latest Indian Famine, by E. H. Pickersgill, M.P. 160
Indian Epigrams... 162
Our London Letter 162
Chronicle of the Week 163
The Sugar Duty Act:
Speech by Mr. J. M. Maclean ... 164
Letters from Mr. Romesh Dutt... 165
The Indian Currency Committee:
The Congress Resolution 165
Indian Affairs in Parliament:
Special Report... 166
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee... 167
Advertisements 168

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE House of Commons has adjourned for Easter, and Mr. Maclean, whose interesting speech at Cardiff last Friday is reported on another page, has not yet succeeded in bringing on the Indian Sugar Duty Act for discussion. First he was prevented by a "blocking" notice from moving the adjournment. Then, by what seems a rather strange ruling on the part of the Speaker, he was prevented from discussing the matter on the motion for the Easter adjournment. Finally, in spite of Lord George Hamilton's promise not to waive the right of disallowing the Act before discussion in Parliament, the Government declines to give a day even after Easter. Mr. Balfour will not commit himself further than to say that it is "not impossible that an opportunity may arise in the course of the next few weeks." For men who are burning with anxiety to justify their policy to Parliament and the public, this studious avoidance of debate seems odd. But the history of the Sugar Duty Act from first to last has been rich in proofs of the extreme lightness of the hold which Parliament has over the course of legislation in India. The Sedition Act was really an even more drastic example of the same weakness. But as it merely strangled the liberty of the Indian people and did not threaten to touch, however remotely, the breeches-pocket of the British public, it was of course allowed to slide. That is the sort of thing which encourages poets to sing of "the white man's burden."

Reuter's correspondent at Calcutta telegraphed on Tuesday that "the entire Press in India, Native and English, without a dissentient voice approves the action of the Government regarding the Sugar Bill." The "entire Press in India" is a rather large order, and it will be important to discover by what means Reuter's correspondent has so quickly been able to inform himself as to the opinions of all the newspapers in the whole of India. As our readers are aware, Indian opinion on the new Act is divided. But there can be no doubt that the Act is approved by very many Indians for reasons with which we for our part cannot agree, though we tried last week to state them fairly. Mr. Romesh Dutt, in two letters (reprinted elsewhere) to the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Times*, explains these reasons as they appear to him; and he is no doubt right in claiming that he speaks in this matter for a very large number of his fellow-countrymen.

The *Manchester Guardian* on Wednesdey last referred in the following terms to Mr. Dutt's letter:—

> He feels sure that, rightly or wrongly—he believes rightly—the natives of India are strongly in favour of countervailing duties for the defeat of bounties. He defends this view by a line of argument which if valid would, we hold, cut at the root of the fiscal policy hitherto pursued in this country and in India. From bounty-fed sugar you would have to go on to deal with bounty-fed ships, meat, and what not; and from retaliating on bounties it is the shortest possible step to retaliating on protective duties, and then good-bye to cheap food and to success in trade outside the Empire. But what if, with the United Kingdom holding this belief, India holds the opposite belief, and thinks that Protection is necessary for her industrial success as strongly as Englishmen hold that it would be fatal to her? Are we, as India's guardians, to do for her what she on this assumption believes to be good for her, or are we to do that opposite which we believe to be good for her ourselves? It is a painful dilemma, but there can be little doubt as to the way out of it. As long as we do not divest ourselves of responsibility for the welfare of India we must do for her what we honestly believe to be best. Of course the fact that she herself strongly desires this or that is a very important element in the choice between courses, an element so important that there must be very strong considerations to outweigh it. But everyone understands that in Ireland, where the same principles are even more strictly applicable, there are questions on which there might easily be a great preponderance of Irish opinion on one side, and on which English Liberals would feel themselves bound, as long as they were in any way responsible for the decision, to take the other—the institution, for instance, of Universities with actual denominational tests, or the revival of protective tariffs. These are things that self-governing peoples may very well do for themselves, but it would be better for one people to resign all responsibility for the welfare of another than to do such things for it against its own conscience.

The *Mahratta* comments on the Plague Commission and the evidence submitted to it during its visit to Poona. In the first place the Commission is not empowered to enquire into the suitability and success of the Government measures of prevention, but into the nature of the plague, and as this is a matter in which other nations are as much interested as India, it seems unfair to place the burden of paying for this Commission of enquiry on the people of a country already impoverished by an actual visitation. The Indians are more interested in the question of plague administration, but this does not form part of the reference to the Commission. But this being so, the nature of the plague being the subject of enquiry, it is the more curious that among the witnesses summoned for examination at Poona, none of the local medical practitioners nor of the doctors of the caste hospitals were to be found. The non-medical witnesses gave valuable information about administration, but that was not the real matter which the Commission had to investigate.

The feeling of the educated public in Bombay must have been tolerably strong before a body of enlightened and representative men would have banded themselves together to establish a new Law College. It looks as if they thought that the reformation of the Government Law College was totally hopeless. We are well aware of the general tendency to cabin, crib, confine, bind in the education of the people; but it is less easy to understand why there should be gross laxness with regard to the technical instruction of students in law. The Committee of Enquiry reported that, whereas the calendar of the University professes that lectures will be delivered on six subjects, only three subjects were tackled, and even these "cannot have been adequately dealt with in the number of hours devoted to them." That exposure is nothing less than a public scandal. Curiously enough, the like shortcomings are discrediting Madras Law School. There the mischief seems to arise from the intrusion of the demands of a professor's practice upon the time-table of his lectures. Possibly the same thing happens at Bombay; but there we hear also of sharp complaints that professors are appointed on grounds other than academic. The independent gentlemen that moved in this matter, if they have not obtained Government sanction for a new Law School, may be congratulated heartily on having stirred up the official mind to some reform of the Government Law School. They will keep prodding, we hope, so that the Law teaching may not only be put upon a sound basis but steadily kept up to the mark.

The *Friend of India* usefully hammers away at the retrograde and unwise policy of the Calcutta Municipal Bill. It points out "three capital defects, any one of which would be sufficient to condemn it in the eyes of prudent and reasonable men":—

> (1) The Bill proposes without adequate cause—indeed it may be said, without any relevant cause—to deprive the people of Calcutta of a valued privilege which they have long enjoyed and the loss of which they are certain deeply to resent. To enact it, therefore, would be in the highest degree unjust and impolitic.
>
> (1) It proposes to substitute for a Municipal constitution which is consistent in all its parts, which contains the germs of a sound and

efficient working system, and which, so far as it has been found defective in practice, is easily susceptible of reform without sacrifice of its main principle, a constitution which is inconsistent with itself, and which contains only the germs of evil—of friction, inefficiency, and mal-administration within, and forfeiture of confidence without. To enact it would, therefore, be a disastrous administrative blunder.

(3) Finally, it proposes to do these things under pretences that are palpably false. To enact it would, therefore, be also shameful.

Perhaps Sir John Woodburn may yet be able to let the light of these arguments into the minds of his Council. The *Friend* admits shortcomings, but traces them to want of money, want of adequate legal powers, constant changes of chairmen, occasional want of an efficient chairman, and other causes "which the Government does not find it convenient to recognise."

The Indian mail brings a good report of the vigorous speech delivered by Mr. Moti Lal Ghose on February 27 as chairman of the great meeting which was held at the Classic Theatre, Calcutta, to protest against the Municipal Bill. The scathing passage in which he dealt with the proposed payment of fees to European members of the General Committee, deserves the best attention of every member of the House of Commons:—

The Europeans would not work in the Municipality; hence, to tempt them, the authors of the Bill had to hold out a bait in the shape of a fee of Rs. 32 per sitting. The object of this provision was plain—it was to transfer power from the hands of willing guardians to those of unwilling aliens and thus to Europeanise the Corporation. The arrangement was unnatural, and whatever was unnatural was bound to fall. If a child were taken from its mother and placed under the care of a paid nurse, it was bound to suffer. The European Chamber of Commerce in their memorial, however, complained that the condition attached to the provision was rather harsh, namely, that in order to earn the fee of Rs. 32 a member should have to attend the meeting from beginning to end. Here was then an interesting fight over the only substantial thing in the whole Bill. Government was anxious to exact some work from the Europeans, but the Chamber would not agree to this. The position of the Chamber was something like this. Addressing the Government it said in effect: "You know and we know that our only interest in the Municipality would lie in the prospect of securing two gold mohurs per sitting. Why then would you cruelly impose conditions which would do you no good but would do us immense harm? You insist that we should attend from beginning to end. Suppose we do it, but spend the time in enjoying an afternoon nap or writing mail letters. You will have yet to give us our fee, even if we did no work. Why, then, this absurd condition? Good brethern as you are, you have generously opened a new source of income to the Europeans. Why do you then ungenerously impose conditions? Please, therefore, remove them so that we may attend meetings, remain there as long as we like, and return home with 32 rupees in our pocket." (Laughter.)

Has the House of Commons really grasped the fact that this retrograde Bill proposes to transfer the real work of the Calcutta municipality from the Indians who have hitherto discharged it zealously and gratuitously to an official majority of Europeans—birds of passage who have so little interest in the matter that they are to be induced by a substantial bribe to attend municipal meetings? Mr. Moti Lal Ghose stigmatises this scandalous proposal as exhibiting "the genius of the whole measure," and he is right.

Last week we outlined the case where Mr. J. N. Ross, manager of the Mohanpur tea garden, in Cachar, Assam, shot dead one Native and seriously wounded another. The tragedy took place on February 7. By three o'clock in the afternoon of the same day, the relatives of the dead and wounded men lodged information at the Hailakandi police station; and before evening Mr. Ross had sent in his own account of the occurrence, alleging that he fired in self-defence. Yet he was not arrested for two days. The *Bengalee* remarks pertinently:

No attempt was made to arrest Mr. Ross until fifty hours had elapsed after the first information, and when arrested he was treated like a prince, being lodged in the Dak Bungalow under a guard of eight policemen—shall we call it a guard of honour? The most distinguished Indian Mahárájá would not have been treated thus under similar circumstances. But whatever the law may be, blood is thicker than water, and the administrators of the law take care to make things comfortable for men of their own race.

And again:

We need hardly add that the proceedings will be watched with the keenest interest throughout the country; for tragedies of this kind are of frequent occurrence, and Europeans in India must be taught the one great lesson which they have not yet learnt—that the law recognises no distinction of colour or creed, and that all subjects of the Queen, no matter whether high or low, European or Indian, are equal in the eye of the law. This was the lesson which Sir Francis Maclean sought to enforce in the most impressive manner from his place on the bench, but apparently the lesson has not yet been learnt.

There is nothing for it but to "peg away" until the cruel injustice and oppression be brought home to the minds of the English electors.

Mr. Augier's case was commented upon in our issue of March 3, and then we said we awaited "further light on Mr. Maguire's part in the business." Mr. Augier, who was a Sub-Deputy Magistrate, it will be remembered, was convicted before Deputy Commissioner Maguire of Purulia for trying to obtain possession of a young Brahmin coolie girl and sentenced to six months' rigorous imprisonment—a sentence summarily quashed by the High Court. Writing to the Commissioner of the division, Mr. Augier says explicitly, "Mr. Maguire wanted an excuse to injure me," and "you yourself," he forcibly adds, "would be about one of the best witnesses I could offer in support." Beyond that he points to Mr. Maguire's charge to the jury, and states that the jury "were not selected according to the list, but according to Mr. Maguire's fancy."

His selection of the jury were (1) Mr. Cook, *coolie contractor*; (2) Babu Ahoy Sirkar, *coolie contractor* (absent); (3) Mr. Massyek, *photographer of coolies to all coolie contractors*; and (4) Annant Ram Sirkar, *clerk to Ahoy Sirkar*.

This list speaks for itself. Further, when the case was under appeal, and the High Court ordered Mr. Augier to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the District Magistrate, Mr. Maguire is alleged to have refused to release him, so that he was kept in gaol six days longer. We look to it that there will be a searching enquiry into these most serious allegations. And at the same time we should like to know why Mr. Augier is not restored to his position in the service?

The *Times of India* returns to the Poona murders, and speculates and theorises in a somewhat helpless fashion. Our contemporary "can scarcely be sure" that this tragic history has "even been ended by the conviction of Balkrishna Chapekar and the murderers of the Dravids." The witnesses on behalf of the Crown seem to have been in danger, real or supposed; and the leisurely methods of Wasudeo, Ranade, and Sathe appear to suggest that there may be similar leisurely gentlemen on the prowl with the view of adding another act to the tragedy. The suspicion is by no means groundless. But the motives of the criminals have been very fully exposed. While it is unfortunate that the *Mahratta* should speak of them as "brave and generous youths," youths of "extraordinary courage and bravery," and so forth, it is fatuous to yarn about there being criminality enough in the three Chapekars to supply the requirements of an entire Newgate Calendar." Given the first motives of Damodhar, all the rest follows. The *Times of India* speaks more to the purpose when it says this:

The original theory which attributed the murders on Jubilee night to a single hand has been discredited by the avowals of at least four participants in the crime. But from that fact to the conclusion that there was a widespread conspiracy would be an inference much larger than the ascertained facts would warrant.

What can our contemporary think of the officials who told us there was "a widespread conspiracy" before any of these facts were ascertained?

There is said to be an incredibly foolish missionary who has made the following assertions in a recent number of the *Indian Church Quarterly Review*:

Hinduism, being a pure matter of ceremony, places no check on vice, and demands no change of heart.

To seduce an unmarried woman is no sin at all.

The Hindus, as a race, are probably the most immoral, treacherous, and cunning people on the face of this wicked earth.

It is hopeless to understand the attitude of mind, or the imbecility of mind, that could permit any man charged with duties of a missionary to utter such unintelligent perversions of fact. If he be still in India surely the *Mahratta* is right in thinking that such utterances bring him within the law of sedition; for "the wholesale defamation he has hurled at the Hindus as a race is sure to create enmity and hatred between Christian missionaries and Hindus." We confess to be unregenerate enough to think of the duck-pond; but probably the *Mahratta* is of the wiser opinion, "that such things are contemptible and deserve to be treated as such." "He is, we are sure," says the forgiving *Mahratta*, "sufficiently punished in the depravity of his understanding and heart." What society is responsible for letting this person go unmuzzled?

The Cantonments Bill—"a Bill to make better pro-

vision for securing house accommodation for officers in cantonments"—is still the subject of severe popular condemnation, in spite of its innocent title. Everybody is willing enough that officers in cantonments should be provided with adequate house accommodation. But, as we have already explained, this oppressive and confiscatory Bill proposes to accomplish its ends by inflicting gross injustice upon both the owners and the occupiers of such houses as may be considered desirable for the use of civil and military officers. It just comes to this, that under this Bill an officer may come to a house, order the occupier to turn out, and take possession at his own terms—at his own terms, for unless his proposal for rent be very markedly, shamelessly inadequate, it is plain enough that the arbitration provided will do little for the proprietor. The Government seems to claim some sort of interest in such houses as are in question. Speaking of Barrackpur, the *Bengalee* says:—

The Cantonment was established in 1780. Lands were given to military officers to build their temporary houses. These passed into the hands of proprietors who purchased them. In the first instance, the bungalows were all thatched, and the structures were of a very unsubstantial character. The Cantonment authorities compelled the house-owners to raise substantial buildings with pucca roofs, so that, at the present moment, the value of the land is infinitesimal when compared with the value of the structures raised; and the Government, taking advantage of the small, fragmentary interest which it thus possesses in the buildings, proposes to pass a law which is an act of spoliation, pure and simple!

Other people besides the *Bengalee* will read the provisions of this Bill "with a sense of profound astonishment."

The *Madras Mail*, reviewing recent discussion as to a British guarantee of the Indian Debt, concludes that "public opinion at home will have to be educated a good deal before it will assent to the guarantee being given."

England could not remain a first-rate and solvent Power after the loss of India; and were she to make default in regard to her own proper debt, her position would not be greatly aggravated by her making default also in regard to the debt of her Dependency.

If the question were to be examined on its merits, there would be little difficulty in striking a balance between the advantages and the disadvantages of a guarantee. But the present undefined position—a tacit guarantee without a formal guarantee—suits to a nicety the English idiosyncrasy. And a formal guarantee is not to be thought of in the present temper of Indian bureaucracy, whose greatest dread is to be overhauled in the House of Commons.

We have now before us a copy of the petition, dated March 9, presented by Mr. M. R. Bodas on behalf of the Ratnagiri Khots Association to the Governor of Bombay in Council. The petition, following up previous petitions addressed to Lord Sandhurst and to Lord Curzon in Council, constitutes a strong exposition of the shortcomings of the Khoti Act Amendment Bill (No. IV of 1898), on the lines of the principal resolution passed by a large public meeting of the Khots of Ratnagiri District on February 18. The essential need of the occasion in the Devgad Taluka—which is the worst case—is an amendment of the existing Act so as to admit a revision of the decisions recorded by the Settlement Officer—the very point to which the Hon. Mr. Khare's Bill was directed. "The incidents of Khoti tenure in different villages," says Mr. Bodas, "are so diverse, and the grievances in individual cases have been so varied and numerous, that no general legislative measure could ever suffice to cover them all." The remedy of an appeal from the Settlement Officer would seem to be an exceedingly simple thing. But the Government is more ambitious and comprehensive. Mr. Bodas comes to the following general conclusion:

The Bill, as drafted at present, is sure to prove harmful both to the tenants and to the Khots. Nor will it achieve the object of Government, namely, a final settlement of the vexed question of Khoti tenure once for all. It will, on the contrary, create new complications, multiply disputes and stimulate litigation. It will, besides, disturb the cordial relations that are at present prevailing between the Khots and the tenants, and will create an unhealthy rivalry which is sure to prove ruinous to both of them. It will, finally, impoverish the Khot, retard improvement of agriculture, and make the condition of the rayat worse than it ever was. It is not advisable to court all these evils for some imaginary benefits expected to accrue from fixed rents.

"Almost all the difficulties that have arisen under the present law," says Mr. Bodas, "are due to the bad drafting of sections 17 and 33 of the Act of 1880." Now the Rhatnagiri Khots complain, with only too good reason, that the proposed amendment of section 17 "will have the effect of taking away the existing jurisdiction of civil courts with respect to lands in Khoti villages"—surely a very strange result. The proviso to section 31, limiting the assistance to be given by the mamlatdar to a managing Khot, in all cases where a crop-share is payable but the amount of produce is disputed, to a sum not exceeding twice the assessment fixed on the land, "cannot be justified on any ground except as an expedient to discourage the crop-share system and create *maktas*" (fixed rents). The Ratnagiri Khots say it is "ambiguous, impracticable and mischievous." The other main points are summarised in the resolution referred to:—

The proposed additions and alterations in section 33 are not only vague, unnecessary and inadequate, but also highly objectionable in principle and subversive of the ancient rights of Khots with respect to annual appraisement and the rent due from occupancy tenants. The amendments will tend ultimately to destroy the Khoti tenure and ruin the Khots as well as the rayats.

The proposed addition to section 40 is defective, inasmuch as it ignores the rights of Khots to forest lands.

These statements are substantially self-explanatory; but those who take particular interest in the questions at issue should see the full illustrations of the working of the sections as set out in Mr. Bodas's argument.

An Anglo-Indian Correspondent writes:—"So the *Pioneer* and its echo at Bombay consider 'it is much to be regretted that the scheme has come to nought'—this 'scheme' being that described as the Indian Princes' Victoria Health Institute, a designation intended to deceive. It is now plainly spoken of as 'a scientific bacteriological institute.' As is well known in this country, this stands for a congeries of laboratories in which pestilent bacteria of sorts are 'cultivated' in the living bodies of helpless animals, and where those dumb creatures, having been tortured by artificially-made maladies, are 'scientifically' utilised to produce poisonous concoctions to be afterwards injected into the human frame. The regret of the Anglo-Indian journals, so far from being shared by the Indian peoples, will with them become cause for rejoicing—not less in that the 'coming to nought' of the influentially patronised scheme exemplifies the success of persevering and well-directed agitation. After other efforts it is just a year since the Indian Anti-Vivisection Society (at Bombay) issued a circular letter to the Princes and Chiefs who had previously been canvassed and coaxed by political and medical officers to join the beguiled Mahárájá of Dholpur. The letter explained the 'evil and ignoble' nature of the proposed Indian Pasteur scheme. Then a short time before the new Viceroy left the real character of the plausible Dholpur speculation was placed before him in a well-considered memorial, to which his lordship replied that he would look into the whole subject. So our Indian friends may as well give Lord Curzon part of the credit for this blessed relief.

"But the opponents of Pasteur inoculations as a preventive of or cure for rabies must not rest content with this negative victory. They are bound to show that the official medical world in India is thrown on its defence so long as it persistently ignores the natural, safe and effective remedy everywhere at hand wherewith to combat that dreaded malady—namely, sudorific treatment. Its efficacy was demonstrated many years ago by Dr. Buisson on his own person, when, just as the morbid stage of hydrophobia came on him, he had sense and volition left enough to place himself in a vapour bath which he chose as a lethal chamber, but which proved to be for him the gate of new life. It is well known to everybody, except medical and commanding officers in India, that appliances ready for the relief of patients bitten by dogs supposed to be mad have, by the generosity of a philanthropic and public-spirited body, been placed in all the large cities and near the chief cantonments in India. Several cases in which the symptoms of hydrophobia in India had set in have been rescued and cured by means of these portable baths. It should be forced on the attention of the authorities there that if commanding officers and their medical advisers persist in sending soldiers or others supposed to be infected with rabies to Paris and neglect to apply the safe and efficacious remedy at hand they do so at their own peril."

INDIA AT THE DAWN OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.[1]

THE writer of this book, which is profusely and beautifully illustrated and contains some very interesting maps and diagrams, looks to Christian missions as the sole hope of India, and is separated from the religions and civilisation of the country by a thick wall of prejudice and contempt. The particular social usages that happen at the moment to commend themselves to the ever changing Western world are to her the only righteous ones, and the particular phase of Western religion known as "evangelical Protestantism" is for her the only true religion. As might therefore be expected, her view of India is not impartial. But it might have been hoped that she would at the dawn of the twentieth century have no longer had recourse to the old abusive methods of religious polemic. This unhappily is not so. Religions in which she does not believe are all "false," although held in perfect good faith, and it does not seem to occur to her that "erroneous" or "mistaken" would be more accurate terms. Such words as "idolatry" come over and over again, and we have such pleasing quotations as this description of the spiritual state of the Hindus: "no God but a log of wood or a monkey . . . no morality." Throughout she shows no appreciation of the services which India has received from her historic religion. A civilisation which was already old when Alexander crossed the Indus, when Christianity was still unknown, and the peoples of Northern Europe were savages, only moves her to disgust. Nor does she scruple to adopt that obsolete method which consists in picking out from the vast mass of Hindu custom, tradition and literature those parts which she thinks most offensive and calling on her readers to judge the Hindu religion by these. It is a method which when applied to the sacred books of Christianity has been strenuously denounced by Christians; it is a method by which no ancient creed with roots going back into earlier stages of society can be fairly judged; and it is to be hoped that it is a method which can now only discredit those who venture to use it. It is not thus that the great religions of the world should be judged. It is not thus that the ancient religion of India can be put aside—a religion which has remained unshaken while civilisations have risen up, and grown to maturity and passed away, which has given unnumbered millions a moral support that has enabled them to pass through the fires of conquest and foreign domination erect and unscathed.

But if there is one point more than another in which Miss Guinness has misjudged the civilisation of India, it is in her descriptions of the Indian family and the Indian home. It is not necessary to claim for these institutions that they are perfect. In the West the family has for several generations been subject to bitter attack and continual modification. Nevertheless by the standard of this changing and unstable institution Miss Guinness fearlessly judges and condemns the Indian family and all its ways. Some of her remarks read curiously. Thus she complains that, in the words of an Indian woman, the Indian wife had "to look upon her husband as a God." Milton could write of Eve: "He for God only; she for God in him." So the Brahmins are in good company. But when Miss Guinness goes on to speak as if the Indian family was bad because the women had not "freedom of thought and action, and social equality with man," she belongs so completely to another world as to be incapable of forming any real judgment. On the contrary, it may be affirmed that nowhere is the family more stable, nowhere are the ties of kinship more lasting, nowhere is family affection wider and stronger than in India. Certainly the English family out of which the sons pass almost as soon as they can earn a livelihood, perhaps never to see parents or brothers again, cannot be compared with it as a school of filial and fraternal affection, and many an English mother, though she have "freedom of thought and action" and even "social equality with man," may envy the Indian mother who is surrounded by her sons alike during her life and on the bed of death. The Indian family has its dark places, but it need fear no comparison with the domestic institutions of other lands.

It must indeed be allowed that Miss Guinness is impartial in her comminations. The Mahometans are accused of intolerance and many other sins, though it might be thought that in the matter of religious persecution they had a cleaner record than the Christians; while lest the Hindus should think themselves too severely dealt with she even includes in her proscription as idolatrous the largest and most powerful of the churches which profess the name of Christ. But in cases where her polemic zeal and her desire to proselytise do not interfere with her natural good feelings she shows herself more sympathetic. One of the most interesting chapters in the book is that entitled "Inside a Famine Poorhouse," which contains some vivid descriptions. Of the generosity of the British public she speaks thus:—

> Although the Government of India estimated that six millions of money would be needed to efficiently relieve the famine of 1897, not more than one million was given by England that spent ten times as much with a light heart on her Diamond Jubilee celebration. What mockery it seems to call ourselves a Christian nation when we lavish millions without thought or hesitation for the showy spectacle of a single summer's day, and cannot afford more than a sixth of what is needed to relieve *thirty millions* of our fellow-creatures suffering from "one of the most terrible calamities that ever afflicted mankind."

The missionaries, however much opinion may be divided as to their main work, have it in their power incidentally to do India a great service. Belonging to the ruling race, and yet independent of the Government and desirous of gaining the confidence of the people, they can be the eyes through which the English public may see the misery of India, and this quite independently of the success or failure of their propaganda. In their work of conversion they have to encounter several difficulties. The ease and elegance in which many of them live, and which affords Miss Guinness considerable gratification, does not at all answer to Indian ideas of devotion and self-sacrifice. In Madras city, a great missionary centre, the Salvation Army alone inhabits Black Town and lives after the manner of the people. Again, the conduct of Europeans towards Indians is not calculated to arouse enthusiasm for a European religion. The Hindu reformer, Vivekananda, put this very well:—

> You come to us with your religion of yesterday—to us who were taught thousands of years ago by our Rishi's precepts as noble as your Christ's; you trample on us and treat us as the dust beneath your feet; you destroy life in our animals; you degrade our people with drink; you scorn our religion, in many points like your own; and then you wonder why Christianity makes such slow progress in India.

But more than all, a religion which requires the Indians to break with their past, which is not only foreign but bears no relation to Indian civilisation, is bound to awaken distrust. The contempt Miss Guinness expresses for all that the Indians hold most sacred can hardly fail to intensify this feeling and so hinder the very cause she would give her life to help.

[1] "Across India at the Dawn of the 20th Century." By Lucy E. Guinness. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1898.

THE LATEST INDIAN FAMINE.[1]

By E. H. Pickersgill, M.P.

THE Report of the Indian Famine Commission which has just been laid before Parliament forms (without the appendices which we are told are expected shortly) a bulky Blue-book of nearly 400 pages. The object of the enquiry, as expressed in the terms of reference, was "to furnish guidance for the future," and the Commissioners were "concerned with the past only in so far as might be necessary to that end." The report however vindicates in many important respects the criticism which has from time to time appeared in this journal. The Commissioners mention several instances where "hesitation to commit the State to the great expense of famine relief led to loss of life which might have been avoided." Of these instances the most flagrant occurred in the Central Provinces. An article in India of April 22 last (page 244) contained a record of the terrible mortality in these Provinces during the monsoon months of 1897, together with an analysis of the extraordinary attempt made by Mr. T. W. Holderness, Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, to deny the correctness of the figures, and to suggest that the attribution of these deaths to starvation was merely the "conjecture" of village watchmen! A theory was started that the heavy mortality was due to fever of a specially malignant type, and with a view

[1] Report of the Indian Famine Commission, 1898. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty.

to test this theory a special enquiry in the villages was instituted. But the Commissioners report that the theory which had been advanced

was not supported by the general tenour of the replies. . . . . In some districts the largest proportion of deaths during the monsoon period was said in these replies to have occurred among people who, though hard pinched, were not quite poor enough to have been willing to go on the relief works or to be held entitled to get village relief. But in many districts the number who died on relief works, or after leaving them, or while in receipt of village relief, was shown to be very remarkable.

This result is scarcely surprising when we consider the amount of the village relief dole and the scale of wages on relief works. The report states that by the Chief Commissioner's orders a rule was made restricting the dole to be given to any family to five rupees per mensem *however many members it might contain*, and the Commissioners add:—

There is reason to fear that the relief so given was often insufficient properly to maintain life and health, particularly as the recipients were frequently in an emaciated condition before they began to get the dole.

Again, the wages on the relief works were reduced to a scale which in the poorhouses themselves was generally thought insufficient by the medical officers even for people in fair health. The Chief Commissioner, however, defended the scale, and reported in October, 1897, that "the workers often grew fat and saved money on it." The comment of the Commissioners upon this statement is eminently sensible and humane:—

As to saving money (they say), experience shows that the wish to leave the works and anxiety as to the future induces some natives of India to save out of any wage, but it is at the cost of their own health and that of their children. If people ever grew fat on this wage, we think it must have been due, as the Chief Commissioner suggested, to some cheap food, such as the *mahua* fruit, being temporarily available; but the *mahua* crop was over by the end of April, and the number of people who had stores of it to last much after that time must have been few. In our opinion the scale is, if unsupplemented, too low a wage to maintain for any time in proper health or strength people doing fairly hard work on relief works; and dangerously low if the people come to the works in a reduced condition, as they frequently did in the Central Provinces.

Upon the whole the Commissioners, while recognising the great exertions of the officers of the local Government, feel compelled to express the opinion that

the degree of success in the saving of life and relief of distress in the Central Provinces was not all that it should or might have been.

Turning to the North-Western Provinces we find that there also the wage on the relief works was in practice reduced below the minimum prescribed by the famine code. In the opinion of the Commissioners the modified system of payment by results which was adopted was

no doubt effective and economical from the point of view of outturn of work;

but they

are not so sure that it adequately relieved all the dependents and the inefficient labourer class. It was expected greatly to reduce the number of these people on the works, and it had that result. *There was severe distress in some of the localities to which it was applied.*

Of all the local Governments whose districts were affected by the famine, the authorities of the North-West Provinces departed in the most numerous and important respects from the practice prescribed by the code: and while the Commissioners

agree in the general verdict that the result was a most conspicuous success and a great administrative feat,

they wisely point out that

some of the measures adopted with the view of economy contained elements of risk, and can hardly be recommended as general lessons for guidance in a future crisis of the same character.

It is interesting and significant that among the qualities of the local Government which contributed to success, the Commissioners assign a prominent place to "a great power of enlisting the services of the leaders of Native society."

For the protection of India from famines in the future, the Commissioners recommend an extension of irrigation works. They show that the area irrigated by the State irrigation works has been increased by nearly 50 per cent. in the last twenty years. They point out that the principal recommendations made by the Famine Commissioners in 1880 for the extension of irrigation have all been carried out with the exception of the Gandak, Sarda, and Tungabhadra canal projects, and the Ken Canal in Bundelkhand. The Commissioners consider that none of the first three projects "can at present be confidently recommended;" but having regard to the claims of Banda, in which the distress during the late famine was probably more acute than in any other part of India, they heartily endorse the proposal to re-examine the project of the Ken Canal in greater detail, to bring it up to date, and reconsider it on its merits. The Commissioners also consider that there is urgent necessity for irrigation works in the Bombay Deccan.

Irrigation works are of two kinds: those urgently necessary for famine protection in populous districts, and those which are designed for the extension of irrigation to areas lying waste and uncultivated, but culturable if water were conveyed to them. Of the latter class the Chenab Canal in the Punjab is the most conspicuous instance. In the opinion of the Commissioners the success of this scheme has been complete. Up to the end of 1896-7 more than half-a-million acres had been allotted to settlers drawn from the more densely populated districts of the Punjab, and the land thus allotted was immediately broken up and brought under cultivation. For the lands remaining to be allotted the difficulty is not to find settlers, but to select the most eligible among the crowd of applicants. Encouraged by the success of the Chenab Canal, the Commissioners recommend other schemes on similar lines for the Punjab itself, for Sindh, and for Upper Burma. Upon the whole, the irrigation works of a productive class proposed by the Commissioners are calculated to entail an outlay of about Rx. 12,000,000, while it is estimated that they would lead to an increase of 3,820,000 acres in the area annually irrigated from assured sources of supply. The report suggests that "these works should be prosecuted as energetically as may be consistent with true economy and ultimate efficiency, even though this may involve a higher annual expenditure in the future than in the past." It appears that the average expenditure on productive irrigation works since 1879-80, excluding the purchase of the Kurnool-Cuddapah Canal, has amounted to Rx. 540,000 per annum. At this rate the execution of the new programme would extend over twenty years at least.

The report embraces some discussion of the vexed question of the economical condition of the Indian people, and of their power of resistance evinced in the late famine as compared with previous calamities of a similar kind. Here it is satisfactory to find that the Commissioners administer a cold douche to over-sanguine officials. Thus it is stated that the Bombay Government take "rather too sanguine a view of the situation" in the Bombay Deccan and Southern Mahratta country; that the Commissioners see no sign of improvement in the portion of the North-West Provinces south of the Jumna generally, and in particular in the Bundelkhand districts and South Allahabad; while the view of the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces is described as "much too sanguine." Regarding India as a whole the Commissioners consider that

Of late years owing to high prices there has been a considerable increase in the incomes of the landholding and cultivating classes, and that their standard of comfort and of expenditure has also risen. . . . . The skilled artisans, except the weavers, have also greatly improved their incomes and their style of living, and very few of them required relief.

This is so far satisfactory, but it serves to heighten by contrast the distressing condition of the mass of day labourers and the less skilled of the artisans. In the opinion of the Commissioners, this section of the community,

Far from contracting, seems to be gradually widening, particularly in the more congested districts. Its sensitiveness or liability to succumb, instead of diminishing, is possibly becoming more accentuated, as larger and more powerful forces supervene and make their effects felt where formerly the result was determined by purely local conditions.

Attention has frequently been called by this journal to the fact that the indebtedness of the agricultural classes, in many parts of India at all events, is largely due to the pressure of the land revenue. There is a passage bearing upon this subject in the report, which contains a very caustic reference to officialdom. After inculcating the duty of making remissions of land revenue in lean years, the Commissioners proceed as follows:—

In temporarily settled districts the large increases generally taken when the terms of settlement fall in may be considered to cover any balance of these remissions not covered by the Famine Relief Insurance scheme. We take this opportunity of remarking that any want of proper liberality in granting these remissions at times of great loss of crops and cattle would in our opinion be inconsistent with the present policy of readiness to make great changes of laws and regulations in the hope of saving the agricultural

classes from indebtedness. This seems plain, but with a strongly departmental system of Government such an inconsistency is not impossible. Each department is apt to find reasons for its own hard and fast rules, though it is apt to cry out against the rigidity of those of other departments.

INDIAN EPIGRAMS.[1]

NOT since Edward Fitzgerald's never-to-be-forgotten rendering of the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam fell unheeded upon the London market has any such delightful offering of Eastern poetry been presented to the Western reader. How Fitzgerald's poem had to wait for its recognition until Rossetti picked up a copy from the fourpenny box outside a second-hand bookseller's shop and carried it home in triumph, is a familiar story. May the present generation of critics show themselves more discerning than their predecessors and award to Mr. More at once his meed of unstinted praise!

There are many things in this "Century of Epigrams" to remind the reader of Omar Khayyam; and, as in the case of Fitzgerald's Rubaiyat, the question arises: How much of the poetry belongs to the Sanscrit original and how much is due to the English translator? Some of the best things in Fitzgerald's poem were interpolations or mistranslations, more or less wilful; like that magnificently audacious climax:—

For all the Sin wherewith the Face of Man
Is blackened—Man's forgiveness give—*and take.*

So it may be that some of the noble sayings in this book owe more to the translator than to Bhartrihari. This only increases the measure of our debt to Mr. More. It is seldom indeed that a translator can be thus charged with heightening the poetry of his original.

In intensity of interest this "Century of Epigrams" is not comparable to the Rubaiyat. We miss the thread with which Fitzgerald so ingeniously wove together into a single poem the quatrains of Omar. Here are only "short swallow flights of song"—an orderly sequence, it is true, with a distinct progression, but each tiny poem still complete in itself. Nor is the imagery of Bhartrihari as a rule so fine and impressive as that of Omar. When the two enter into direct competition with each other the victory is generally with the Persian poet. Compare for instance Bhartrihari's quatrain—

If the Creator moulding goodly man
A pearl designed him to adorn the earth,
And then so fragile made that at the birth
It breaketh,—whose the folly of the plan?

with the famous allegory of the potter and the pots; or again—

All we in one long caravan
Are journeying since the world began;
We know not whither, but we know
Time guideth at the front, and all must go.

with—

Think, in this batter'd Caravanserai
Whose portals are alternate Night and Day,
How Sultan after Sultan with his Pomp
Abode his destined Hour, and went his way.

Yet Bhartrihari's imagery too is often magnificent. For a parallel to this one would have to go to the Phædrus of Plato:—

Seated within this body's car
The silent Self is driven afar;
And the five senses at the pole
Like steeds are tugging restive of control.

And if the driver lose his way,
Or the reins sunder, who can say
In what blind paths, what pits of fear,
Will plunge the chargers in their mad career?

Drive well, O Mind, use all thy art,
Thou charioteer!—O feeling Heart,
Be thou a bridle firm and strong!
For the Lord rideth and the way is long.

And in three respects at least Bhartrihari may be said to have the advantage over Omar—variety, love of nature, depth of moral feeling. The epigrams have something to say on all the great facts of human life: love, friendship, wisdom, wealth and poverty, separation, death. On all these things, unless the first be excepted, the thought is true, deep and tender: *Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.* Only of the higher possibilities of love we feel that the Indian poet has no witness to give. To him woman is only a "barrier in the heavenly path," "man's inevitable curse," a "wizard's basket stored with all the conjurer's magic hoard of vain illusions." Like the wise man of the Hebrews, he has found one man in a thousand, but one woman in ten thousand has he not found. Nature is described, not for its own sake but (as in the Epigrams of the Greek Anthology) as a background of human emotion. But many a lovely touch shows how strong a spell "this beguiling world," with its fair gardens and pleasant pools, had cast upon the soul of the Eastern poet; how strong, too, was the sterner attraction of the lonely forest and the sky-towering peak. As to his depth of moral feeling, he is no preacher with Omar of the doctrine, *Carpe diem.* He is a prophet of the great Renunciation, like all the noblest souls of all the creeds.

Dear brother, I have found the way
Though steep and narrow: and they say
Of old 'twas trod by many a seer,
Who knew his end and climbed from sphere to sphere.

From yonder pure celestial height
Flooding our path a wondrous light
Pours on us; and where'er we go,
This haunting shadow of ourselves we throw.

So be it: if along the track
On Sorrow still we turn our back,
We too may climb to that high doom
With light before us and behind the gloom.

The English poet whom Bhartrihari most nearly approaches in creed and temper is Matthew Arnold. It was a happy thought of Mr. More's to remind the reader of him by deftly interweaving into his translation more than one phrase from the poet of "Self-Dependence" and "Obermann." He has added, too, to the obligations of his readers by the pleasant pages of just criticism prefixed to his book. On the form which he has given them—a letter to a learned friend—the captious critic may pass the censure which Mr. Dangle passed upon a famous episode in Mr. Puff's tragedy of Tilbury Fort: "Mr. Puff, as he knows all this, why does Sir Walter go on telling him?" But then Mr. Puff's answer is conclusive: "But the audience are not supposed to know anything of the matter, are they?" Of Mr. More's metrical skill and poetic taste the quotations given above will have furnished ample evidence. Certain licences which he has allowed himself in rhyming ("malice," "palace," "afford," "reward") are something of a blemish, and they must be unnecessary to so skilled a translator.

[1] "A Century of Indian Epigrams." Chiefly from the Sanskrit of Bhartrihari. By Paul Elmer More. (London and New York: Harper and Brothers.)

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

ALL Sessions, like all Gaul of old, are divided into three parts, and the first part of the session of 1899 has ended. The members have gone away for what they no doubt regard as their well-earned holidays. It is doubtful, however, whether the public will regard the holiday as having been particularly well-earned. The Session, so far, has been chiefly remarkable, not for legislative achievement, but rather for the interest and influence of private business. I use the word "influence" advisedly, for there is no denying that "lobbying," or as it is more forcibly and picturesquely described in America, "boodling," has reached limits this Session unknown in past years. When a railway Bill is coming on, the lobby swarms with "agents"; when the fight between the multi-millionaires Rockefeller and Rothschild over petroleum was imminent, the air of the lobby was thick with touts and registered letters. And the scandal is becoming worse every day. Indeed there are not a few members who are anxious that the Speaker shall lay it down as a parliamentary understanding that when a member brings a stranger into the lobby that stranger shall be supposed to be inspired by simple curiosity, and shall not try to advance any commercial matter or political question in which he may be interested. There is but little "simple curiosity" about some men who are always to be seen plucking the sleeves of members whenever a question involving money-making or trading interests is coming on in the House.

We like to chant the praises of the British Parliament as being the first and greatest deliberative assembly in the world, and as setting an example to all others. In some, nay in many, respects it is the best, not because of its own inherent virtues, but because of the badness of the others. But it has its faults, faults neither few nor small. And nothing has let down the

standard of Parliament more than the influx of what, for want of a better word, I must call "the bounder," let loose by the Tory party at the last general election. The other day a member in referring to the telephone transactions of Sir James Fergusson, at one time Governor of Bombay, spoke of them as a "scandal." It struck me as a mild expression in the circumstances, but the Speaker ruled that the word "scandal" when used in connexion with the name of an hon. member was unparliamentary. So it may be; and as Mr. Speaker says it is so, I recognise cheerfully that so it is. But an allegation may be unparliamentary without being untrue, and if you were to tell anyone who knows his House of Commons well, that no member of that House is capable of doing anything scandalous, he would laugh in your face.

Since I last wrote the Government has carried the second reading of its London Government Bill by the big majority of 127. Few of the large number who voted for the Bill had heard the debate. They came swarming in when the division bell rang, and took their orders from the Whips with the docility of sheep being "encouraged" by sheep-dogs. The chief interest of the debate, so far as I could see, lay in the fact that the Liberal view was introduced to the House by Mr. Herbert Gladstone, the son of the great parliamentarian, and was supported in a brilliant maiden speech by young Mr. Trevelyan, the son of Sir George Trevelyan, who but the other day was on the Liberal Front Bench, and the grand-nephew of Lord Macaulay. Of course the House of Commons, and particularly the good Radical, has no belief in hereditary legislators. At the same time the House takes quite a tender interest in the *début* of the son of some past worthy, and I noticed that no man was more eager than Mr. Balfour in calling "new member" when young Trevelyan rose with three or four other members, and by calling "new member" he obtained for Mr. Trevelyan a hearing at once, for according to the unwritten laws of the House, more firm and fixed than the laws of the Medes and Persians, a maiden speech takes precedence.

I was extremely interested last Wednesday in a debate which seems to have attracted but little attention as to slavery in Zanzibar. It was shown in that debate that a young woman, and then her two parents, relying on the invitation of a British official, had been induced to place themselves in the clutches of some scoundrel who claimed them as slaves. One of our missionaries protested, but our representative refused to interfere, arguing that as the poor creatures could not deny that they were slaves he could do nothing. That is bad enough, in all conscience, but it struck me that the case was made worse by the attitude taken up by Mr. Brodrick. He argued that after all slavery is "not so bad," that it did not imply cruelty necessarily, and so on and so forth. It struck me that there were other days when if a British Minister had stood up in the House of Commons and pattered in a double sense with that "sum of all villainies" slavery, he would have had a warm time of it. But the House of Commons, like many another institution, is suffering from decadence, and this pseudo-defence of slavery was rather well received.

So also were Mr. Chamberlain's references the same day to the Old Age Pensions scheme. Mr. Chamberlain has one invaluable gift for a public man. He can keep his face straight while he has his tongue in his cheek. When the general election was on he promised all sorts of pensions to almost every one who wanted them. What he was after was votes for his party, and having obtained them he declared only the other day that he was too much engaged by the business of his department to trouble himself about Old Age Pensions! On Wednesday last he took up a middle position between enthusiasm and indifference, and promised that the whole subject should be referred to a Select Committee. And so the game is played to the amusement of the House of Commons, while the deluded, deserving and hardworking poor still think that Mr. Chamberlain means what he says.

I attended the dinner given on Wednesday week in honour of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman at the National Liberal Club —a club in which I often meet cultured fellow-subjects who are natives of India. Sir Henry made a fine speech, at once witty and forcible; but in one part he wandered into Greek, which is from the reporters' point of view an unpardonable offence. He had referred to the numerous surrenders of this "great and powerful" Government, as to education, vaccination, railway couplings and many another matter, and then he pictured the Liberal party standing on one side and chanting in the style of a Greek chorus "Ὀτοτοῖ ὀτοτοτοῖ, alas for courage and alas for consistency." I said when I heard the expression, "I wonder what the telegraphists will make of Ὀτοτοῖ?" but as the event turned out, the London papers who could not plead the excuse of telegraphic errors made a fine hash of it. The *Daily News* gave it as "Ote Toi," which was fairly funny; but I confess I could scarcely believe my eyes when I saw that the *Standard*, the grave and decorous old *Standard*, reported the expression "Hoity-Toity! alas for courage and alas for consistency!" The notion of beginning the dismal wail of a Greek chorus with such a cocky phrase as "Hoity-Toity" is supreme in its daring. I can only imagine one expression better, "Hi-tiddley-hi-ti-ti!"

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, March 23.—In the House of Commons the debate on the second reading of the London Government Bill was resumed, speeches being delivered by Mr. Asquith, the Solicitor-General, Mr. Courtney and Sir Edward Clarke.

It was officially announced in Paris that on Monday M. Delcassé would submit to the Chamber a Bill approving the Anglo-French Conventions on African questions. The *Débats* and the *Figaro* commented on the new agreement in a favourable tone; the *Eclair* complained that it inflicted "cruel sacrifices" on France and gave her little in return, but added that, inasmuch as the treaty meant peace, this was not the moment to complain.

A St. Petersburg journal gave a painful description of the distress now prevailing in the famine-stricken districts, and especially in the province of Samara.

Friday, March 24.—In the House of Commons Mr. Herbert Gladstone's amendment to the motion for the second reading of the London Government Bill was negatived by 245 votes to 118. The Bill was then read a second time.

Sir C. MacDonald left Peking yesterday for Taku, where he was to embark for Wei-hai-Wei.

The Court of Cassation sat in Paris, when M. Ballot-Beaupré read his report on the application of Mme. Dreyfus's counsel that three of the Judges of the Court should be excluded from taking part in the revision proceedings on the ground that, as members of the special commission originally appointed to consider the admissibility of Mme. Dreyfus's application for revision, they had committed themselves to a view opposed to revision. M. Ballot-Beaupré recommended that the application should be rejected, while M. Manau, the Procureur-Général, held that it should be granted. After deliberation the Court rejected the application, and imposed on Mme. Dreyfus a fine of 100f.

Saturday, March 25.—The University boat race was rowed over the usual course from Putney to Mortlake, and, after being stiffly contested for the first two miles, was won by Cambridge by three and a quarter lengths in 21 mins. 4 secs. This was the first victory won by Cambridge in the contest for ten years.—At a conference on Old-Age Pensions held at Birmingham, Mr. C. Booth expounded the general principles of his proposals, and stated that he intended shortly to formulate a scheme. A resolution was passed giving general and hearty support to the principles enunciated by Mr. Booth.

President Kruger, in a speech at Rustenburg yesterday, denied the statement attributed to Mr. Chamberlain that he had made promises and not carried them out, and challenged Mr. Chamberlain to prove anything to the contrary. He could not understand some of Mr. Chamberlain's observations on the policy and action of the Transvaal Government, attributed them to Mr. Chamberlain's being afraid that he (President Kruger) would make peace with the English in the Transvaal, and was sorry that Mr. Chamberlain should make such statements on hearing lying reports. The only grievance of their enemies was clearly expressed in the sentence: "Give the Transvaal back to England." All the unrest came from without.—A petition to Queen Victoria, purporting to be signed by 21,000 British subjects in the Transvaal was handed yesterday to the British Agent in Pretoria for transmission to the High Commissioner.

The American forces in the vicinity of Manila began this morning an attack on the insurgent lines north-west of Caloocan. The enemy whose numbers were estimated at 12,000 offered a stubborn resistance at some points, and the progress of the Americans was to a certain extent impeded by the difficult character of the country; but the result of the fighting was described by General Otis as satisfactory.

Monday, March 27.—In the House of Commons the Sale of Foods and Drugs Bill was committed to the Standing Committee on Trade.—The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Bill was read a second time.

Mr. I. B. Cox (Conservative) and Mr. Corrie Grant (Liberal) were nominated as candidates for the vacancy in the representation of the Harrow division of Middlesex caused by the appointment of Mr. W. Ambrose, Q.C., to a Mastership in Lunacy. The polling was fixed for Wednesday, April 5.

Sir James Westland's Budget was debated in the Legislative Council. There was a general recognition of the ability shown by Sir James during his term of office as Financial Minister in the management of the public finances. Some of the members advocated remissions of taxation, and Mr. Arthur, the representative of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, strongly urged the reduction by half of the telegraph rate between India and Europe and the immediate permanent convertibility of the currency into a gold international standard of value. Replying on the whole debate, Sir James Westland said that the Government could not consider any remission of taxation until a general position of surplus was established. The question of a reduction of the telegraph rate was engaging the attention of the Secretary of State. In bidding farewell to the Council, Sir James expressed the hope that the season of prosperity would last long enough to enable the Viceroy to take up the many

suggestions made during the debate. In summing up the discussion, the Viceroy said that he believed the rupee would retain during the ensuing year the position it had held during the past twelve months, and he himself should be disappointed if they were not able to invest the 16d. rupee with a greater durability than it had ever hitherto attained.

Count Muravieff sent a circular to all the Russian diplomatic representatives abroad instructing them to convey the Tsar's thanks to all who, by letter or telegram, had expressed their assent to his Majesty's humanitarian work.

TUESDAY, March 28.—The House of Commons adjourned for Easter.

A protracted meeting of the London County Council was held. The Chairman of the Finance Committee announced a prospective reduction of a halfpenny in the new rate. The recommendations of the Local Taxation Committee regarding the London Government Bill were adopted, after a long struggle between Progressives and Moderates.

During the discussion of the Budget in the French Chamber a proposal to levy a tax of 60f. per head on foreign workmen was referred to the Labour Committee.—The Court of Cassation continued the examination of the War Office secret *dossier*.

The advance of the American troops towards Malolos was continued. On Monday there was some severe fighting, in which the South Dakota Regiment, repulsing the attack of Aguinaldo's forces with slaughter, themselves suffered rather severely in a brilliant charge.

Mr. Justice Jenkins, of the Calcutta High Court, was appointed Chief Justice of Bombay.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

SPEECH BY MR. J. M. MACLEAN.

In the course of a speech at the annual banquet of the Cardiff Chamber of Commerce on Friday last (March 24) Mr. J. M. Maclean, M.P., said:—

It was known to many of them that he had lately taken an active part in discussing some legislation which had been brought forward in the Indian Empire. He thought he had some right to speak on matters of that kind, not only because he lived for many years in India, and because he understood public opinion out there—perhaps, understood it much more thoroughly than any official of the Indian Government who ever lived in that country—but also because he had recently been there, and after an absence of twenty years had refreshed his knowledge of the Indian people. What was his authority for what he was saying? He did not go out there simply to take a holiday survey of India. He did not go out there as many men did who were born to high rank and position in this country—who went out with letters from the Foreign Office and India Office, and who were sent to Government House, Bombay, Calcutta, and Lahore, and also to the camp of the Commander-in-Chief on the frontier, and who came back to say that they knew all about India. As a matter of fact, those gentlemen in nine cases out of ten might just as well have stayed at home. What did they know of the people unless they mixed with them on equal terms; unless they lived amongst them, and unless they knew their ways and manners; unless they had fought them in many controversies, and unless they had eaten and drunk with them, partaken of their business and social pleasures, and unless the people had confidence in them and told them what they wanted and what they desired? That was the way to know the people of India; but in order to obtain that experience they must live amongst them and be as one of themselves. (Applause.) That was his fortune for some years, and, as one who directed a great daily newspaper in a country where free institutions did not exist, he spoke with authority, because the people came to him, and the men who bowed down in Government House the night before and appeared to be devoted to the English Government would come to him and tell him their inmost feelings and their grievances against the Government. A man might live there—be he Viceroy or Governor of Bombay or Commander-in-Chief—and might not hear a word of the truth. But when a man like himself went amongst the people and lived his daily life amongst them, one who knew the people and was loved and respected by them, he alone had the power and the authority to speak for the people of India. (Applause.) His mission to India was after the lapse of twenty years, and what Indian official after twenty years would have been so recognised and applauded? (Applause.) He (Mr. Maclean), after those twenty years, was received with acclamation as a man who had done good service to the country. (Applause.) He did not attribute that to himself alone. He went back with a title, certainly, but not with a knighthood, a baronetcy, or a peerage, or any other decoration, for he had not a Jubilee medal or an old-age pension. (Laughter.) But he was a member of the House of Commons; and when he went amongst the people he was told of acts of despotism which had driven the people into a state of fear as to what the Government might do to them. He was told that a Press law had been passed of a most severe description, which prevented a man from saying what he really thought; and not only was that the case but a few months ago something like a ukase from the Indian Government was issued. There was a frontier campaign two years ago, and everyone knew it was a perfect fiasco from beginning to end. A public meeting was called in one of the great cities by the Commander-in-Chief, and an unfortunate civil servant of the Crown ventured in free discussion upon a paper to express what was the opinion of all India as to the real history of that campaign, and a military order was issued and actually promulgated very much the same as Darius the king sent out to the Persian empire, that any official, civil or military, who ventured to criticise the Government, might be punished for what he said. That was a most dreadful state of things. (Applause.) No Government could live in any country unless it was supported by public opinion. Speaking of Oriental despotisms, he pointed out that there was a great deal of free expression of opinion under an Oriental government, where people mingled on equal terms and with none of the class distinctions that existed in this country. The absolute ruler was bound by certain rules, and a great deal of free criticisms were often heard, which were forced upon him in India. People came to him in Bombay—Natives and Europeans—and asked were they better off than they would be under their own government. He said to them: "This country is not governed by officials; these are the servants of the Secretary of State, and your Secretary of State is the servant of the House of Commons. The supreme power in this country is the House of Commons, and no man, be he European or Native, can be persecuted for the free expression of his opinion. (Applause.) He has only to come to the British House of Commons for redress." (Applause.) Now that was an important reason for saying that the interference of the House of Commons in Indian affairs was absolutely essential. He would be the last to say that it was desirable that the British House of Commons should interfere in the details of Indian administration, which work he left to the Government of India. They must not forget that the Government of India was a delegated body, constituted by the House of Commons, and that the House of Commons in giving certain powers to the Government of India had not parted with its inalienable right to interfere with the Government of India itself, and that right should be exercised whenever necessary, to prescribe certain principles, either political or commercial—(applause)—which was the only guarantee left for freedom of any kind in India or in the government of the country. He had thought it necessary to make that explanation, because the other day he found he ought to make a protest, because the *Times* newspaper in a very respectful, and in many ways flattering, commentary upon a letter he wrote to that paper, said the doctrine he put forward of interference with the administration of the House of Commons was unsound and dangerous. (A voice: "No.") With the limitations he had placed before them, he considered that the doctrine was perfectly sound. (Applause.) Without the interference of the House of Commons, as a breath of fresh air blowing away the cobwebs from time to time, they could not have a sound or good government. (Applause.) He would not refer in detail to the particular measure which he had mentioned. They were going to have a debate, he believed, after Easter. His idea was to make a protest in the House of Commons before the Bill for imposing countervailing duties on sugar was passed by the Indian Government. (Applause.) If he had been left alone that would have been done, but he yielded to the request of the Leader of the Opposition to wait until Sir Henry Fowler, who used to be Secretary of State for India, came back to London. And meanwhile some difficulties in connexion with the sugar bounties prevented him from moving in the House of Commons. Never more would he give way to his friends on the Front Bench, or take anyone into his confidence as to what he proposed to do. (Applause.) He would not go into the question whether countervailing duties in India were advisable or not. Some of those present might entertain different opinions upon that subject. For his own part, he would desire nothing better than to secure a fair fight between Free Trade and Protection in this country. It would clear the air, and would be of the greatest benefit, but what he insisted upon was that the procedure by which India was being during the last week hustled into Protection was deserving of the severest condemnation. (Hear, hear.) He was not speaking now as a party politician. India was quite beyond the reach of party questions in this country. He was quite aware that the officials in India had always been Protectionists, and very likely a great number of the people, having no enlightened party, were also in favour of protective duties. The natural man had always been more or less a Protectionist. It required a great deal of education and a sustained effort of free will to make a man a Free Trader. (Hear, hear.) In India the people were not very well educated, and when the Government said, "This is for your benefit," they accepted it without any criticism or qualification. Twenty years ago they wanted to put protective duties on Lancashire goods imported, in order to stimulate the growing industry of the manufacture of cotton goods in India; but Lancashire people would not put up with it, and Parliament put a stop to anything of that kind. (Applause.) The same effort was now being made with regard to sugar. He did not complain of what the Indian Government was doing. What he objected to was that the Secretary of State for India and the Governor-General of India, who were Englishmen, with thorough training in Parliament, should have listened to the Indian Government without consulting public opinion in this country. Mr. Chamberlain—and his friend Mr. Ferrier knew he (Mr. Maclean) did not always admire the policy of the Colonial Secretary—had in many speeches during the last few years led people to imagine that he was in favour of putting a countervailing duty on sugar to counteract the bounties. That was the impression that prevailed in this country, but Mr. Chamberlain had found that public opinion on the other side was too strong for him, and latterly he had abandoned it, and lately he has said that in the present state of public opinion he would not propose anything of the kind. Only the other day Lord Selborne, who spoke for his chief as well as for Mr. Chamberlain, said that they had not converted public opinion in this country to their side, and without public opinion nothing could be done. But what was the action of the Indian Government? Lord George Hamilton's proposal came as a surprise to everybody. Nobody heard of any discussion here or in India until the announcement was made that countervailing duties were to be imposed. He (Mr. Maclean) at first gave the whole credit to Lord George Hamilton, but it had since appeared that Lord Curzon, who had only been in India three months, and who could not possibly have had time to study the question, actually came forward and proposed a scheme of this kind without knowing what English opinion

might be. But Lord Curzon had gone a great deal further in his speech in the Legislative Council of India. He said that, no doubt, he would be criticised, but he had done this as a protective measure to certain industries in England, and hoped this would be an example which would be adopted in other parts. This was a piece of presumption no officer of the English Empire should be guilty of. (Applause.) The House of Commons was the supreme governing body of the Empire. It was perfectly competent to manage its own affairs, and it did not want advice from either the Viceroy of India or anybody else as to the commercial policy which it ought to shape in this Empire. (Hear, hear.) He said that that commercial policy was absolutely secured. No Minister for the last fifty years had ventured to disturb it. Nobody, he believed, in this country, if it came to an actual trial, would try to put a countervailing duty upon sugar, for after all what was sugar in every household in this country? It was, next to bread itself, the greatest benefit that could be conferred upon the people to have cheap sugar. (Hear, hear.) In every household it was used in an infinite variety of ways. It was the foundation of the aerated bread shops and the confectionery shops which were springing up everywhere, and which were such a formidable competitor against the public-house. It was used in the brewing trade and a variety of other trades. He believed that whatever was done in that way—in the way of putting on duties to raise the price of sugar—would be disapproved by all the people of this country. (Hear, hear.)

MR. ROMESH DUTT ON THE SUGAR ACT.

The following letters from Mr. Romesh Dutt have appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* (March 23) and the *Times* (March 28) :—

To the Editor of the "Manchester Guardian."

Sir,—I have read with attention and interest the article on the Indian Sugar Bill in your issue of this morning, as I always read everything relating to India contained in the *Manchester Guardian*. And if I differ from you on this subject, I am sure you will permit me, with your usual fairness, to state my opinion, which is the opinion generally held by my countrymen.

The error which underlies your contention is that this Bill, which has been passed into law, will "make sugar dearer to poor people" in India. I believe it will have no such effect. The poor people consume raw sugar produced in India, with which the Continental bounty-fed sugar did not compete, and the price of which the import of the bounty-fed sugar did not in any way affect. The price of the raw sugar in India was determined by its cost of production, and will remain so, unaffected by the present Legislative Act. For the millions of consumers in India the Continental sugar did no good, and the restriction on its import will do no harm. Refined sugar is consumed by a very limited and well-to-do class of people, and this class will possibly have to pay a higher price after the passing of this Bill. This is, so far, a disadvantage. Against this is to be set the advantage of the protection to sugar industry and sugar cultivation secured by the Bill. The disadvantage is insignificant; the advantage is immense. Sugar cultivation is an important and profitable industry in many parts of India. The date tree is tapped, the cane is grown and pressed, and hundreds of thousands of cultivators derive incomes from the manufacture of raw sugar. Much of this raw sugar is consumed as such, or is used in confectionery; but a portion of it went to factories to be refined. To restrict the factories by importing bounty-fed sugar is to restrict the cultivation of the sugar cane, and thereby to lessen the income of the agricultural population. To help the factories by protecting them from unfair competition is to extend sugar cultivation and to improve the condition of the cultivators.

The comparison with the corn laws of England is misleading. The million in England can get cheaper bread by importing corn; the million in India did not get cheaper sugar by importing European bounty-fed sugar. The abolition of corn laws in England cheapened bread for the million; the absence of a countervailing duty did not bring cheaper sugar to the million in India. To reimpose corn laws would make bread dearer for the million in England; the passing of the Sugar Bill in India will not make Indian raw sugar dearer for the million. What the passing of the Sugar Bill will do is (1) to make refined sugar consumed by the upper classes a little dearer, and (2) to help the sugar-growers and poor cultivators all over India by increasing the demand for raw sugars in the refining factories. I look forward to the increase of such factories now, and the consequent increase of sugar cultivation in India.

All interference with Free Trade is more or less mischievous. But the sinners in the present instance are the Governments which offer bounties to force their commodities on other nations, not the Government which imposes a countervailing duty to protect a native industry from ruin.—I am, etc.,

Romesh Dutt,
March 21, 1899. Late of the Indian Civil Service.

To the Editor of the "Times."

Sir,—Permit me, as an Indian, to say a word on the subject of the Indian Sugar Bill which is the subject of so much discussion in this country. In passing this Bill, Lord Curzon has protected an extensive and important Indian industry from ruin by unfair competition, and has acted in strict consonance with educated Indian opinion. I am a regular reader of native Indian papers from all provinces in India, and, in so far as they have expressed themselves on this subject, they have frequently regretted the decline of the sugar industry, and have repeatedly and strongly urged legislation to protect it from unfair competition. The last article I read on the subject is in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of February 23, urging the Government to take the very action which the Government did take on March 20. On the other hand, I have not seen a single line in any native Indian paper against such legislation. I have seen private messages wired by representative leaders of Indian opinion, and these messages are in favour of the Bill, not against it. And of the three members of the Viceroy's Council, two cordially welcomed the Bill and the third did not oppose it.

It is not true that this Bill is in the interests only of sugar factories managed by European capital in India. It is in the interests of thousands of Indian workmen who find employment in the factories. And more than this it is in the interests of hundreds of thousands of growers who supply raw sugar to those factories. The area of sugar cultivation in India was becoming contracted by unfair and bounty-fed imports, and the growers of Indian sugar were losing a legitimate means of subsistence. Lord Curzon has saved them and their industry.

During twenty-five years, from 1871 to 1896, I had opportunities of watching the sugar cultivation in many districts of Bengal. Both the date sugar and the cane sugar are extensively produced, and in the cold weather, when an official does his tours in India, I noted how largely the villagers of some districts were employed in pressing the cane and tapping the date tree for the juice, which is boiled down into raw sugar. A great part of this is used for the preparation of Indian sweets and confections, but a large part of it is also taken to factories to be refined. The ruin of the factories would, therefore, largely affect sugar cultivation, and would be a calamity to the people. Lord Curzon has saved them from this calamity.

I have not been a consistent supporter of the recent legislative measures of India; and in a recent number of the *Times* I took the liberty of pointing out some defects of the Calcutta Municipal Bill—defects which I have every hope will be rectified before the Bill is passed into law. But I can honestly give my unreserved support to the Indian Sugar Bill, and, what is more, I represent herein the general opinion of my countrymen.

Permit me only to add that I am a free-trader in principle. But I hold that the principles of Free Trade are violated by the Governments which offer bounties to force their commodities on other nations, not by the Government which imposes a countervailing duty to protect a native industry.

Yours faithfully,
Romesh Dutt,
Late of the Indian Civil Service.

THE INDIAN CURRENCY COMMITTEE.

RESOLUTION FORWARDED FROM THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

The following letter was sent on February 28 last by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, to Sir Henry Fowler, Chairman of the Indian Currency Committee. Enclosed with the letter were reports of the speeches delivered by Mr. D. E. Wacha and Mr. G. Subramania Iyer, the mover and the seconder of the resolution referred to :

British Committee of the Indian National Congress,
84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster,
London, S.W., *February* 28, 1899.

Sir,—In accordance with the resolution of the Indian National Congress I have the honour to communicate the following resolution, unanimously adopted by the Congress at Madras in December last, for the favourable consideration of the Indian Currency Committee:—

Resolved—(*a*) That having regard to the fact that the principal cause of the loss by exchange is the steady growth in the demands on India for expenditure in England, this Congress is of opinion that any artificial device for meeting that loss either by changing the currency at a heavy cost or contracting the internal currency must add to the pressure on India's monetary resources and to her trading disadvantage.

(*b*) That the only real relief carrying out practically the principle, affirmed by competent authorities, of England bearing an equitable share of that expenditure.

(*c*) That the Congress regrets that, save Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt and Mr. Merwanji Rastamji, competent and qualified Indian representatives have not yet been invited as witnesses to represent the Indian view of matters on the subject which now engages the attention of the Currency Committee of which Sir Henry Fowler is the President.

(*d*) That the President be authorised to request Sir W. Wedderburn, Chairman of the British Congress Committee, to communicate this resolution to Sir Henry Fowler, Chairman of the Currency Committee in London.

In order to show the considerations which appear to have influenced the Congress in passing this resolution, I beg at the same time to forward a report of the speeches made by the mover and the seconder.

I have, etc.,
(Signed) W. Wedderburn.

The Right Hon. Sir H. H. Fowler, M.P.,
Chairman, Indian Currency Committee.

The following letter, together with copies of a pamphlet con-

taining Mr. Wacha's speech on the Currency resolution, has been sent to each member of the Currency Committee:

British Committee of the Indian National Congress,
84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster,
London, S.W., *March* 24, 1899.

Sir,—With reference to the resolution of the Indian National Congress, already forwarded for the information of the Currency Committee, I now have the honour to forward to you herewith an authorised copy of the speech of Mr. D. E. Wacha, the mover of the resolution.

At the same time I beg to draw your attention to the statements submitted to the Currency Committee by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who was especially recommended by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, in my letter of June 25, 1898, as a witness fitted to state the Indian view of the case, but who has not yet been called to give evidence.

I have, etc.,
(Signed) W. Wedderburn.
Chairman.

The following acknowledgment has been received:—

India Office, Whitehall, S.W.
March 27, 1899.

Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th instant and of a copy of a speech by Mr. D. E. Wacha, which was forwarded therewith for the information of the Indian Currency Committee.

I have, etc.,
Robert Chalmers.

Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.,
Chairman of the British Committee
of the Indian National Congress.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, March 23.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE KHYBER PASS.

Colonel Milward asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was intended to withdraw the British troops from Lundi Kotal and to hold the Khyber Pass by Khyber levies:

Whether it was intended to complete the fort upon Suffolk Hill, above Lundi Kotal:

Whether a satisfactory water supply defensible in case of need had been obtained:

And, whether the supporting force at Peshawar would be increased or rendered more mobile.

Lord G. Hamilton: The answers to the first and last clause of my honourable friend's question are in the affirmative. The position and construction of the proposed fort on Suffolk Hill, and the question of its water supply, are still under consideration.

Mr. J. M. Maclean: Will the supporting force at Peshawar be instructed to support the Native levies and not leave them in the lurch? (Hear, hear.)

Lord G. Hamilton: I do not think that question arises out of, or is in any way connected with my answer. (Hear, hear.)

BOUNTY-FED SUGAR.

Colonel Milward asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that the doubling of the sugar bounties by continental nations in 1896 and the closure of the United States to bounty-fed sugar in 1897 caused a vast increase in the supply of such sugar to the Indian market:

Whether he could inform the House the weight of bounty-fed beet sugar landed in India in the years 1894-5 and 1897-8 respectively:

Whether the importation above alluded to caused an immediate shrinkage in the price of sugar, and also in the acreage under sugar cultivation in India:

What was the acreage under sugar cultivation in the Provinces of Bengal, Bombay, and the Central Provinces, in the years 1894-5 and 1897-8 respectively:

And, whether, *inter alia*, the results were also disastrous to the neighbouring Colony of Mauritius.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am aware that a great increase in the imports of bounty-fed sugar into India took place in the year 1897, though I cannot state with certainty the causes which led to it. The amount of sugar imported in 1894-5 was 282,000 cwts.; in 1897-8, 2,182,000 cwts. I am also aware that there was a great decrease in the acreage under sugar cane in India between 1895-6 and 1896-7; the figures for 1897-8 have not yet reached me. Great apprehension has been caused among the sugar growers in the Mauritius by the increasing importation into India of bounty-fed sugar, but I do not know that any disastrous results have as yet been produced.

RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

Mr. Price asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would grant a return of the mileage of railways under construction and in contemplation in India, with particulars of cost both actual and estimated; also, a similar return of waterways and irrigation works:

And, whether he could see his way to making this an annual return.

Lord G. Hamilton: I will lay on the Table a return giving the information for which the hon. member asks, and I think it would be well to make it an annual return.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India, if the Bombay and Kurrachee Chambers were among the important public bodies consulted by the Government of India in order to ascertain public opinion on the proposal to place a countervailing duty on foreign bounty-fed sugar:

And, if those Chambers expressed opinions adverse to the Bill which had now been passed into law.

Lord G. Hamilton: The text of the opinions of the various Chambers of Commerce on the sugar duties question has not yet reached me, but a telegraphic summary of the opinions received states the Kurrachee Chamber thought a duty uncalled for on general theoretical grounds, but admitted they had no opportunity of noting effect of imports on home industry. The Bombay Chamber expressed somewhat similar opinions.

I hope to receive and lay on the Table these and other papers on the question within a few weeks.

Friday, March 24.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION WORKS.
RETURN GRANTED.

On the motion of Mr. Price, a return was granted showing the estimated position, as regards capital expenditure, of the several railways and irrigation works under construction, on March 31, 1899, and the proposed expenditure thereon during 1899-1900.

THE MURDER OF COLONEL LE MARCHANT.

Sir F. Dixon Hartland asked the noble lord whether he had received any further account than that mentioned in the papers of the lamentable murder of Colonel le Marchant in the Khyber Pass.

Lord G. Hamilton: No, sir, I have no further information beyond this, that the report is corroborated and that the murderer has been arrested.

ACCOMMODATION FOR LASCAR SEAMEN.

Colonel Denny asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the question of sufficiency of accommodation for Lascars was fully considered by the Indian Government lately:

Whether a clause to assimilate the Indian to the British law in this particular was abandoned after careful consideration of a petition by the Lascars themselves, who declared themselves fully satisfied with the existing arrangements:

And, whether it was shown on that occasion that the present allowance of space was ample for the health and comfort of the Lascars.

Lord G. Hamilton: The answers to all three clauses of my honourable friend's questions are in the affirmative; but I should add that the Select Committee, on whose recommendation the proposal to increase the space for Native crews was abandoned, based to some extent their recommendation on the fact that they thought such an alteration of the law would be out of place in a Consolidation Bill.

Colonel Denny asked the President of the Board of Trade, whether, seeing that there were employed in the mercantile marine of Great Britain and India at the present moment many thousands of Lascars, would he state whether any complaint or representation had been received from any reliable source as to insufficiency of accommodation provided for them on board ship.

Mr. Ritchie: No complaint has been received from Lascars employed in the mercantile marine of Great Britain and India through any reliable source as to insufficiency of accommodation provided for them.

Monday, March 27.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

COMPENSATION TO OFFICERS.

Major Rasch asked the Under-Secretary of State for War why the promises and conditions given in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for War on June 24, 1881, had not been carried out in their integrity in respect of the compensation to be awarded those officers whose careers he decided to cut short by four years, and whom he designated as officers now in the rank of colonel who had elected to remain in the army because of the prospect of reaching the list of generals, etc., the value of whose present prospects were to be safely guarded, and the mitigation of the severity of whose compulsory retirement had formed one of the main objects of his arrangements in bringing out the Royal Warrant of 1881;

And why in the case of those officers who were holding appointments in India at the time of their compulsory retirement the compensation awarded them for loss of appointment as laid down in the Royal Warrant had not been calculated according to the pay and staff salary of such appointments defined by the India Office and the Indian Army Regulations under which they were serving.

Mr. Powell-Williams: The promises referred to in the first paragraph have been carried out. As regards the second paragraph the compensation was calculated upon that portion of the officers' emoluments which represented their Indian pay, exclusive of allowances in respect of which they were not entitled to compensation.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.
A DAY FOR DISCUSSION REFUSED.

Mr. Flynn asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs,

whether his attention had been drawn to the statement of M. Hezedues, Minister of Commerce in the Hungarian Chamber, on the 22nd inst., respecting the action of the Indian Legislative Council in imposing countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar; also to the statement of M. Hezedues that the action of the Indian Government contravened the most-favoured-nation treaty between Great Britain and Austria-Hungary; and, if so, would the Foreign Office undertake to represent that view to the Indian Legislative Council.

Mr. Brodrick: These statements have not yet been brought to my attention, but all the circumstances were fully weighed before the imposition of countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar was decided upon by the Indian Legislative Council.

Mr. Lawrence asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, having regard to the important question raised by the action of the Indian Government relating to sugar and to the failure of the Brussels Conference, he would endeavour to allot a day for the full discussion of the question of the bounties on sugar.

Mr. Balfour: In answer to these questions I have to say that in the present state of public business I can hold out no hope to be able to find special time for these matters, however important they may be deemed in themselves.

In the course of the debate on the question of Public business,

Mr. James Lowther wanted to know whether it would be in order to-morrow to bring forward the motion with regard to sugar bounties.

The Speaker: I will answer that question when I examine the order-book to-morrow. (Laughter.)

MOULVI FAZLAL KARIM.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the serious charges made against Moulvi Fazlal Karim, the present sub-divisional officer of Munshigunge;

Whether he was aware that a memorial signed by 700 of the inhabitants of his district and praying for a public enquiry into these charges and for the redress of certain serious grievances suffered through the administration of this officer was presented to Sir John Woodburn, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, in September, 1898;

Whether so far no order had been made upon it by the Government;

And whether, in view of the grave allegations made in regard to this officer, he could state what immediate action it was proposed to take with reference to his case.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am aware that a memorial containing certain charges against Moulvi Fazlal Karim was presented last year. I have also ascertained that on February 9 the Lieutenant-Governor recorded a resolution accepting the opinion of the Commissioner of the division, who, after a thorough local enquiry, reported that the memorial contained a series of false charges emanating from persons whom the deputy-magistrate had offended in doing his duty. The Moulvi accordingly remains in charge of the sub-division. I propose to take no further action in reference to the case.

PROPOSED RAILWAY IN KASHMIR.

Sir John Leng asked the Secretary of State for India whether H.H. the Mahárájá of Kashmir contemplated building a railway to his capital of Srinagar by way of Jammu at a cost of three crores of rupees, and, if so, would the expense be provided out of Kashmir revenues or by loan;

Had the Indian Government urged or recommended the construction of this line, and would any financial responsibility be incurred by the Indian Treasury in respect of such railway; would any portion of the line be in British territory; and what was the length of the railway and estimated cost per mile;

And, before this large project was decided upon would it be ascertained whether embankments and other flood or water regulation works so long needed in Kashmir had been carried out.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Mahárájá of Kashmir contemplates the construction of a railway 175 miles in length, from Jarwal to Srinagar, no part of which will be in British territory. The estimated cost has not yet been ascertained. The Government of India have encouraged the consideration of the scheme, but do not propose to incur any financial responsibility. No report has been made to me of its possible effect on other proposed public works in Kashmir, but I am able to state that the Government of India have not lost sight of this aspect of the question.

Tuesday, March 28.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.
STATEMENT IN THE HUNGARIAN PARLIAMENT.

Mr. Flynn asked the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in respect to the speech of M. Hezedues, Minister of Commerce in the Hungarian Parliament, on the 23rd inst., whether it was a fact, as stated by M. Hezedues, that the imposition of a countervailing duty on sugar by the Legislative Council of India contravened the most favoured nation treaty on the ground that, according to that treaty, no colony was entitled to impose higher duties on Austro-Hungarian goods than on the goods of any other country, and, if so, what action did the Foreign Office intend to take?

Mr. Brodrick: I can only refer the hon. member to the answer I gave him last night. We are not prepared to accept the views expressed in the question.

THE EASTER RECESS.
THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.
DAY FOR DISCUSSION REFUSED.

Mr. Balfour moved the adjournment of the House for the Easter recess. In the course of the debate,

Mr. J. M. Maclean said he regretted he had not been able to bring on the question of the countervailing sugar duties in India, because of the blocking notice given by the hon. member for Sheffield (Sir H. Vincent). He asked the leader of the House to set apart a day after the Easter recess for the discussion of that important subject of the sugar bounties legislation which had been passed in such haste in India. (Opposition cheers.) He ventured to call attention to the fact that the scope of this regulation had been greatly enlarged by the speech of Lord Curzon in the Legislative Council in India, in which he frankly announced this to be a protective measure which he hoped might be imitated in all parts of the British Empire. (Sir H. Vincent: Hear, hear.) Naturally he expected that cheer from his hon. friend. They knew the policy this represented. It came from Sheffield. (Opposition cheers and laughter.) He did not now wish to enter upon the merits of Free Trade and Protection, but he wished to know as early as possible how far the Government intended to go in the direction of Protection. As the question had been raised in this form by the Viceroy of India with the express approval of the Secretary of State, it was not becoming for the Government to put off a discussion in the House of Commons—(Opposition cheers)—and to allow a blocking motion of the member for Sheffield to interfere with that discussion. His hon. friend in that resolution not only expressed approval of the conduct of the Viceroy, but the hope that her Majesty's Government would immediately follow in the footsteps of the Government of India. (Sir H. Vincent: Hear, hear.) He was sure the leader of the House would feel it to be a matter not to be indefinitely delayed. No doubt with his serried battalions at his back he could carry a resolution for Protection, and then calmly wait till the next general election undeceived him. (Opposition cheers.) He hoped, however, the right hon. gentleman would agree to the important issues involved being submitted to the House of Commons. (Opposition cheers.)

Mr. Balfour: My hon. friend desires that I should give a pledge to find time for the discussion of a very important question relating to India in which he takes a great and natural interest. The Government have not the slightest desire to avoid discussion. On the contrary, we are of opinion that we can only gain by being given an opportunity of laying the arguments which have influenced us before the country. But my hon. friend must be aware that in the present state of public business, in order to select one motion before the House for a particular favour, I should have to sacrifice Government time. It is not impossible, however, in spite of the difficulties which have arisen from the appearance of another resolution on the paper, that an opportunity may arise in the course of the next few weeks for my hon. friend to lay his views before the House. (Hear, hear.)

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On March 13 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee gave an address on India at the Liberal Club, Kettering. Mr. Boyd, presiding over a large attendance, said he had spent nearly three years in India, and from what he had seen there he was of opinion that the country might be more ably governed than it was. He bore testimony to the ability and industry of Indian workmen. The lecture was illustrated by lime-light views.

On March 14 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee delivered an address at Burton-Latimer. The Rev. E. Leader, who presided, said that the treatment of subject races was not sufficiently studied by the electors of Great Britain. He was glad so many were present to learn how their Indian fellow-subjects were progressing. The lime-light views and the lecture were much appreciated.

Speaking at Kilburn on March 17, a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee referred to the great responsibility attaching to English people when they undertook to rule nearly 300 millions of people in India.

On March 21, at the annual meeting of the Southern and South-Western Counties Union of Women's Liberal Associations at Weston-super-Mare, a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee moved a resolution calling the attention of the Government to the deplorable state of the poorer classes in India, and in an able and interesting address explained the land system in India and its faults. The resolution was passed unanimously amidst much applause.

On March 22 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee addressed a public meeting at Watchet. Captain A. Luttrell presided over a good attendance. The lecture was illustrated with limelight views.

On March 23 a public meeting was held at the Northgate Liberal Hall, Bridgwater, to hear an address on India delivered by Miss Alison Garland. Dr. H. S. Pope, who had travelled in India, presided, and said that there was no subject more worthy of the attention and consideration of an English audience than India.

On March 24, a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee addressed a meeting at the Friends' Meeting House, Sidcot, on "India and its People," which was illustrated by lime-light views. Mr. E. Ashby presided.

In 5 Vols.

Vol. I.—Introductory to the Overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago (1623).

With 4 Maps, 8vo, 18s.

A HISTORY OF BRITISH INDIA.

BY

Sir WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER,

K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D.,

A Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LONDON.

BOURNEMOUTH: Invalids and others Returning from India may find comfortable Lodgings and Attendance (with good cooking) at "Debonnaire," Boscombe. References kindly permitted, amongst others, to Sir F. R. Maunsell, R.E., E. I. Service Club; and to Colonel J. W. Fleming Sandwith, Guildford. Address, Mr. D. F. de Souza, 31, Knole Road, Bournemouth, East.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 *pp*.

Published by the

British Committee of the Indian National Congress,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

"INDIA," 1898.

VOLS. IX. and X.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

A limited number of Volumes V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897), can also be obtained. Price 8/6 each, post free. Remittances should accompany order.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., President.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

Soho Square, National Hospital, London, W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

TRADE MARK.

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER know

C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.

G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,

C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "India," should be made to

The Manager,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers Westminster, S.W.